REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-37 are pending. An Office Action mailed May 30, 2008 rejected Claims 1 and 3-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicant hereby respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 and 3-37 as being unpatentable over Briffe and Henderson, previously used, in view of Henderson. Applicant assumes that the examiner intended to base the rejection of Claims 1 and 3-37 for purportedly being unpatentable over Briffe in view of Henderson, because Henderson was not previously used in a prior rejection and it was only mentioned in a conclusion paragraph of the Office Action mailed June 11, 2007. The Office Action states that Briffe discloses a database of radio frequency information stored as a function of radio frequency and a circuit coupled to the database and operating an algorithm for accessing the database as a function of an input radio frequency signal and generating a display signal as a function the input radio frequency signal. The Office Action states that Briffe fails to explicitly disclose generating a display signal as a function of an input frequency signal and a position signal. The Office Action further states that Henderson discloses generating a display signal as a function of an input radio frequency signal and a position signal. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Briffe to include the input radio frequency signal and a position signal for the purpose of displaying a visible signal indicative of the receiver location for navigation information. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The claims clearly recite that radio frequency information is stored as a function of radio frequency, and that a display signal is displayed as a function of an input radio frequency signal. The Office Action states that "Briffe even states that aeronautical information database includes a complete list of navigation aids which includes location and frequencies of each navaid."

Applicant does not understand how that statement, even if accurate, corresponds to storing of information as a function of radio frequency. It merely states that frequencies are stored. There is no indication that information is stored as a function of radio frequency.

The Office Action further indicates that Briffe teaches that the radio can be tuned by clicking on frequencies in the map. This fact does not indicate that frequency information is stored as a function of radio frequency, only that a radio can be tuned by clicking on a frequency. It only indicates that the frequency is stored, not that other information is stored as a function of radio frequency as claimed.

Briffe (col. 10, lines 57-62) describes databases including locations and frequencies of each navaid. Again, this does not expressly state that radio frequency information is stored as a function of radio frequency. It appears from discussion at col. 10, lines 66 et seq., that the frequencies are stored and accessed as a function of location. Thus, the claim language that radio frequency information is stored as a function of radio frequency is not met by the reference.

The Office Action cites col. 6, line 45-col. 7, line 4; col. 9, lines 12-20; col. 10, lines 44-46; and col. 11, lines 25-27 as disclosing accessing the database as a function of an input radio frequency signal and generating a display signal as a function of an input radio frequency signal. This is respectfully traversed. Briffe (col. 6, line 45-col. 7, line 4) discloses at best, that transceivers (not shown) can be tuned manually, or can be tuned by "pointing and clicking" with trackball 44 on a frequency in a digital map displayed on the MFD or the PRD. This language does not support the ability to access a database as a function of an input radio frequency signal as claimed.

Briffe (col. 9, lines 12-20) merely indicates that a pilot ca manually tune an ILS frequency.

Briffe (col. 10, lines 44-46) describes a first geographic map database and an aeronautical information database. As indicated above, the aeronautical information database is

superpositioned on the geographical map database. There is no teaching of accessing information based on a radio frequency.

Briffe (col. 11, lines 25-27) describes data stored for this point in system memory to appear as an information window displayed at the place of the cursor. Again, there is no reference or suggestion that a database is accessed as a function of an input radio frequency signal as claimed.

Henderson (col. 2, lines 28-34) states "the provision of a navigation processor utilizing bearing information from two or three VOR stations to compute a radial from a desired way point intersection; and the provision of a passive airborne radio navigation device which provides a display indicative of the device location in relation to a geographical location distant from any received navigation facility." The claim language that radio frequency information is stored as a function of radio frequency is not met by the reference.

Henderson (col. 2, lines 50-62) states "Also in general and in one form of the invention a radio navigation device employing but a single radio frequency receiver repetitively sequenced between different receiving frequencies includes a processing arrangement for received information from a number of different geographically separated navigation facilities to provide navigational data from a plurality of such facilities by way of the single receiver. In this form, the radio navigation device may either display bearing information relative to a distinct geographical location or may provide a visible or audible signal indicative of juxtaposition of the receiver location and one or more specified radials from specified VOR facilities." Nothing here states that radio frequency information is stored in as a function of radio frequency.

Henderson fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above for Briffe.

Since the references fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination, the elements as arranged in Claim 1, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

Because Claims 3-37 are either similar to or dependent from Claim 1 or similar claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make Claim 1 allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's agent listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM PLLC

Michael S. Smith
Registration No.39,563
Dial: 206.381.3300